

From: "Peterson, Piper" <Peterson.Piper@epa.gov>
To: "Koch, Kristine" <Koch.Kristine@epa.gov>
"Congdon, Julie" <Congdon.Julie@epa.gov>
"Wright, Bernadette" <Wright.Bernadette@epa.gov>
"Bitalac, Emily" <Bitalac.Emily@epa.gov>
"Chu, Rebecca" <Chu.Rebecca@epa.gov>
Date: 8/26/2022 9:16:17 AM
Subject: RE: thoughts on 2 follow-up items for CHB?

The UW was not funded last year though they continued to work for a few more months. I am double checking with Kira as she is a board member for that program. Short story is that it may not be available to refer to going through the University for additional work. OSU may still have its SRP but I don't know the geographic area they work in...only OR?



Piper Peterson
(She/Her/Hers)
US Environmental Protection Agency R10
Superfund Emergency Mgm't Division
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155, M/S **12-D12-1**
Seattle, Washington 98101-3188
(206) 553-4951
peterson.piper@epa.gov

Strength Finders-Winning Others Over
(WOO), Communication, Strategic,
Ideation, Positivity;
DiSC – Di; Meyers-Briggs: ESTJ

From: Koch, Kristine <Koch.Kristine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:41 AM
To: Congdon, Julie <Congdon.Julie@epa.gov>; Wright, Bernadette <Wright.Bernadette@epa.gov>; Peterson, Piper <Peterson.Piper@epa.gov>; Bitac, Emily <Bitalac.Emily@epa.gov>; Chu, Rebecca <Chu.Rebecca@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: thoughts on 2 follow-up items for CHB?

Julie – your responses for the fishers study and fish signage are correct. EPA no longer has a need to do this as we have achieved the target tissue concentrations.

Thanks,

Kristine Koch
Remedial Project Manager
USEPA, Superfund & Emergency Management Division

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155, M/S 12-D12-1
Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

(206)553-6705
(206)553-8581 (fax)
1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)

From: Congdon, Julie <Congdon.Julie@epa.gov>

Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:29 AM

To: Koch, Kristine <Koch.Kristine@epa.gov>; Wright, Bernadette <Wright.Bernadette@epa.gov>; Peterson, Piper <Peterson.Piper@epa.gov>; Bitalac, Emily <Bitalac.Emily@epa.gov>; Chu, Rebecca <Chu.Rebecca@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: thoughts on 2 follow-up items for CHB?

Hello –

Thank you, Piper, for sending me info in regard to CHB's concerns about the aquifer and redevelopment, etc. Below is an edited version of your response that I will include in an email to CHB. Please give it a review and send me your edits.

Also, I'd like to respond to them on the two items that CHB asked about and that said I would follow up on, what edits do you all have to the responses on a fishers study and fishing signage? I feel that my response sounds like EPA is passing the proverbial buck to other agencies, but if those are ones who can better assist (like SRP for a study) or have the oversight (like TPCHD?), then I want to refer them to the best entity who can answer their questions, meet their request, etc.

Thanks, and if you have any question or concerns, please let me know. – Julie

~~~~~

I wanted to follow up on a few items that we discussed when we met:

- **South Tacoma area** – questions or concerns have been raised about the aquifer in the South Tacoma Field in relation to redevelopment projects in the STF area. For any redevelopment activities, they fall within the City of Tacoma's purview, overseeing the permitting and SEPA requirements for redevelopment at the site. The remedial project manager for the site, Piper Peterson, informed me that with all the cleanup work at the site, there is no potential for impacts to the groundwater in this location. The contaminants of concern with the cleanup have been treated (the "hot spot soils" were stabilized and consolidated). For the COCs that were consolidated adjacent to this treated soils area, there is no capability of them leaching into groundwater. This was also determined in the [2018 Five-Year Review](#) which stated that, for wells STM 1A1 and STM 3A1, there was "not a breach in southern containment area and the remedy continues to function as designed." There is one remaining well in the BNSF property (NMW-1A) which exceeds 1 contaminant cleanup level for 1, 4-DCB; however, there is not the "lines of evidence" regarding EPA's attainment analysis process that was provided by BNSF nor relied on by EPA. With this, Piper will have BNSF conduct this analysis as part of the upcoming 2023 FYR. She believes it is likely that this well either meets GW cleanup levels, or it is isolated to 1 well on the property and hence is not contaminating the regional aquifer.
- **Fishers (and/or recreational users) study** – At this time, EPA does not have plans to conduct a study in/near the CB/NT Superfund site. However, you could approach one of the universities that are part of the Superfund Research Program might be able to assist you with this.
- **Fishing signage:** You asked if the signs along the Foss and Dick Gilmour Park could be updated. As Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dept. is the agency that oversees the installation and maintenance of the signs, you would need to work with them to have signage updated to communicate the risks in fishing and recreating in these areas.

---

**From:** Congdon, Julie

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:26 AM

**To:** Koch, Kristine <Koch.Kristine@epa.gov>; Wright, Bernadette <Wright.Bernadette@epa.gov>; Peterson, Piper <Peterson.Piper@epa.gov>; Bitalac, Emily <Bitalac.Emily@epa.gov>; Rebecca Chu <chu.rebecca@epa.gov>

**Subject:** thoughts on 2 follow-up items for CHB?

Hi, all –

I wanted to check in to see what information or insights you have on these two items that I wanted to follow up on with CHB. If you have an answer to these items that I can share with CHB, that'd be great.

- **fish consumption.** They would be interested in a **fishers (and/or recreational users) study**. I don't know if one of the universities that are part of the Superfund Research Program would or could assist with this, or if ORD could do this as a research project. If there was one, would or could we act on any of the findings or recommendations coming out of it?
- **signage:** they asked if it could be updated along the Foss and Dick Gilmour Park. They've seen kids in the water at Thea Foss Park. They are concerned that the signage is old and insufficient, especially in communicating risks at the sites. ***Is it TPCHD that would revise or replace the signage? Who handles this?*** If signage could be replaced, it would be good to work with CHB and those who use the areas to improve the signage.

Thanks! – Julie

**From:** Congdon, Julie

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 5, 2022 8:55 PM

**To:** Koch, Kristine <Koch.Kristine@epa.gov>; Wright, Bernadette <Wright.Bernadette@epa.gov>; Peterson, Piper <Peterson.Piper@epa.gov>; Bitalac, Emily <Bitalac.Emily@epa.gov>; Rebecca Chu <chu.rebecca@epa.gov>

**Subject:** summary of my visit with Communities for a Healthy Bay

Hi, all –

Sorry for the long delay in sending you these notes; I was swamped before leaving (b) (6) and I've been wading through emails and work since getting back.

I met with Erin, Marquis and Phyllis at CHB on June 3<sup>rd</sup> morning at their offices. It was great to talk with them and hear what is of interest to them, their perspective, etc.

- In asking them about the proposed partial deletion and the timing of outreach, including coinciding with the proposed public comment period for the partial deletion in August (as it was at that time; the proposal is now on pause), they felt that the City was putting out the documentary to highlight their cleanup work in CB/NT.
- They don't feel there is a lot of information on Ruston and Asarco. Phyllis said she has spoken with some community members, both long-term residents and new ones, who have no knowledge about the Asarco contamination.
- Regarding the South Tacoma Channel, they said the City gets water from the aquifer underneath the proposed warehouse area, and that the community is *very concerned* about the development (as you know, Emily, Piper and Rebecca).
- They said the Occidental Site is of concern too...
- ...as is fish consumption. They would be interested in a **fishers (and/or recreational users) study**. I don't know if one of the universities that are part of the Superfund Research Program would or could assist with this, or if ORD could do this as a research project. If there was one, would or could we act on any of the findings or recommendations coming out of it?
- For long term involvement with the community, they would like to incorporate visioning about what the sites can be. Regarding reuse/redevelopment, they would like to see a focus on recreation. In thinking of recreation and use at the sites, with Blair Waterway as an example, they said that no one goes to Blair *but* they do use the Foss but users want to know it's safe.  
They are concerned that, by taking an OU like the Foss off the NPL, people will think that it's safe but will their usage increase their risk? That was their question.
- They are also concerned about contaminated stormwater.
- **One ask they had** was regarding **signage**: they asked if it could be updated along the Foss and Dick Gilmour Park. They've seen kids in the water at Thea Foss Park. They are concerned that the signage is old and insufficient, especially in communicating risks at the sites. ***Is it TPCHD that would revise or replace the signage? Who handles this?*** If signage could be replaced, it would be good to work with CHB and those who use the areas to improve the signage.
- Community groups they suggested that we work with or reach out to included the Asia Pacific Cultural Center/Community House and the Tacoma Urban League.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and

if any of you can help me in answering the questions about a fishers/recreational users study and about the signage, that would be great.

Thanks! – Julie

~O  
- || <  
(\*) / (\*)